

Reply to Office Action dated November 6, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-17 and 19-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 16 and 20 are amended and claims 23-24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 16-17, 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Publication 2002/0168976 to Krishnan in view of U.S. Patent 5,734,980 to Hooper et al. (hereafter Hooper). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 7, 10-13, 15, 20 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Krishnan in view of Hooper and U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0153696 to Chao et al. (hereafter Chao). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites receiving system information from a Radio Resource Control of a UMTS Terrestrial Radio Access Network, and obtaining a frequency of each service vendor from the received system information, each of the obtained frequencies corresponding to a frequency band of use for respective service vendors. Independent claim 1 also recites performing a cell search about the obtained frequency of one service vendor based on the obtained frequency of the one service vendor.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, independent claim 1 specifically relates to system information from a Radio Resource Control of a UMTS Terrestrial Radio Access Network. As described in paragraphs

Reply to Office Action dated November 6, 2006

[0027]-[0029] of the present specification in order to provide a global roaming service for a UMTS, a full scan may be needed (i.e., fully scan a frequency band allocated to each service vendor). However, this may cause delays in cell search time. However, embodiments of the present invention relate to specific features of cell searches about obtained frequencies when dealing with UMTS. The Office Action relies on Chao as disclosing a UTRAN. That is, the Office Action cites Chao's paragraphs [0020] and [0013]-[0016] when discussing features relating to system information being received from a UTRAN. However, there is no suggestion to modify Chao's received information from a UTRAN to relate to the obtaining frequencies of service vendors and performing cell searches about the obtained frequency of one service vendor based on the obtained frequency of the one service vendor. The other applied references do not relate to receiving information from a RRC of a UMTS Terrestrial Radio Access Network.

The Office Action appears to combine Krishnan with Hooper so as to find features relating to obtaining a frequency of each service vendor and performing a cell search about the obtained frequency of one service vendor based on the obtained frequency of the one service vendor. However, these features do not relate to a UMTS. Further, there is no suggestion to modify Chao's disclosure of a UTRAN so as to include specific features discussed within Krishnan and Hooper. That is, UMTS is a different system than the systems disclosed in Krishnan and Hooper. Therefore, a suggestion to modify one system does not necessarily suggest a modification to another type of system. There is no suggestion in any of the applied

Reply to Office Action dated November 6, 2006

references for performing a cell search about an obtained frequency of one service vendor based on an obtained frequency of the one service vendor (and being based on received information from a RRC of a UMTS).

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites receiving frequency data of a plurality of service vendors from a Radio Resource Control of a UMTS Terrestrial Radio Access Network, the received frequency data relating to frequency bands of use for each of the service vendors. Independent claim 10 also recites storing the received frequency data in user equipment, performing a cell search about a stored frequency of at least one service vendor in a frequency search, and performing another cell search by frequency bands when a frequency is not found in the stored frequency of the at least one service vendor.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Accordingly, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 16 recites a receiving device to receive system information from a Radio Resource Control of a UMTS Terrestrial Radio Access Network, and a memory to store frequency information regarding service vendors. Independent claim 16 also recites a processing device to obtain a frequency of a particular service vendor from the memory, wherein the

Reply to Office Action dated November 6, 2006

processing device performs a cell search about the obtained frequency when searching the frequency information stored in the memory, the cell search being based on the received system information, the processing device further performing another cell search about other frequencies when a frequency is not found during the cell search about the stored frequency information for a particular service vendor.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 16. Thus, independent claim 16 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10 and 16 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, each of the dependent claims recites features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-17 and 19-24 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/743,296**

Docket No. **P-0611**

Reply to Office Action dated November 6, 2006

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: March 6, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610